

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Project Name

NEPA Number: DOI- BLM-AZ-C010-2012-0022-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No.: 4100

Proposed Action Title/Type: Pipeline Ranch (#00092), La Cienega(#00051), and Hualapai Peak (00047) allotment Transfer's

Location of Proposed Action: Pipeline Ranch (#00092) T. 10 N., R. 8 & 9 W.
La Cienega(#00051) T. 14 through 17 North, R. 14 & 16 West.
Hualapai Peak (00047) T. 15 & 16 North, R. 20 & 21 West.

Description of Proposed Action: The BLM will authorize the transfer of grazing preference on these allotments from current owners to the new owners. This transfer of grazing privileges will be with the same terms and conditions found within the current permit.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved/Amended: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

GM01 Management of rangeland resources will be guided by the Cerbat/Black Mountains (1978) and Hualapai Aquarius (1981) grazing environmental impact statements and range program summaries (RMP, page 24). The objectives for the rangeland management program are listed in the Cerbat/Black Mountains (1978) and Hualapai Aquarius (1981) grazing environmental impact statements (RMP, Page 39).

GM-24/II Manage 25 allotments in the Improve (I) category (RPS 1983); In the RMP page 462 24 allotments are listed in the I category.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

This Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, D. Rangeland Management (1) Approval or transfers of grazing preference.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (See Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.

I considered the plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan, and none of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2 apply, and no further environmental analysis is required.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

D. Signature

Authorizing Official: / s / Don McClure Date: 2/08/2012
(Signature)

Name: Don McClure

Title: Assistant Field Manager

Extraordinary Circumstances	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
-----------------------------	---

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact Mike Blanton, Rangeland Management Specialist (928-718-3707) at the Kingman Field Office located at 2755 Mission Blvd, Kingman, Arizona, 86401.

Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review

1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	No
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	No, the grazing transfer is a name change only, with the same terms and conditions found within the current permit. The grazing season for the allotment will remain the same.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	No
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with significant environmental effects.	No
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.	No
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	No
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	No
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	No

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: (Range Program, Mike Blanton)

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: (Range Program, Mike Blanton)

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: / s / Mike Blanton **Date:** 2/08/2012
*Mike Blanton, Rangeland Mgt.
Specialist
Project Lead*

Reviewed by: _____ **Date:** _____
*Ramone McCoy
NEPA Coordinator*

Reviewed by: / s / Don McClure **Date:** 2/08/2012
*Don McClure, Assistant Field
Manager
Supervisor*

Project Description: The BLM-KFO will authorize the allotment grazing transfers. This transfer of grazing privileges will be with the same terms and conditions found within the current permit.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: / s / Don McClure **Date:** 2/08/2012
**Don McClure, Assistant
Field Manager, Kingman Field Office**

- 1) **Exhibits: Stipulations:** This grazing transfer will contain the same terms and conditions as the current permit and the grazing season will remain the same.